Mr. Richardson arose and repelled the imputation (which Mr. Matteson vehemently denied having made) with great severity; but did not deny that the omission had been made.

Mr. McMullen's motion recurred, and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Olds in the chair.)

Mr. Starbane of Geografia arose and washed.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, arose, and spoke on the Nebraska bill, in opposition to the views of Mr. Meachem, on Wednesday. Mr. Stephens denied that the Missouri Com-

promise was a contract or compact. The line of 36 deg. 30 min. was drawn by legislative enactment, and nothing more. Missouri had previously been admitted.

The North was the first to violate this law.

Upon the admission of Arkansas, the North renewed the contest. The North and the South had agreed, as Abraham and Lot had agreed, in the compact or law. Mr. Stephens reviewed the history of the events upward to

Mr. Stephens was strenuous in his opposition to all legislation by Congress on the sub-ject of Slavery, and contended that no repub-lican could claim the right of our Government to govern freemen after they had gone to dwell

in the Territorics.

Mr. Stephens compared the present manifestations of the opponents of the Nebraska bill to the hissings of demons—to the rebellion of to the hissings of demons—to the rebellion of spirits expelled from heaven—to the manifestations in Pandemonium. He feared no excitement. The North would not resist. The adder would hiss in vain. It had never been killed. The laws had been opposed in the North—Southern blood had been shed there. He spoke of the threats of disregarding the Compromise with respect to Southern territory. But the South asked for nothing with this respect.

respect.

Mr. Campbell arose to reply. He yielded to none in reverence for this Union, and never, until he shall witness the subversion of the purposes for which the Union has been established, will he assent to its dissolution. But lished, will he assent to its dissolution. But he had never believed that conquests were to be made for the purpose of propagating Sla-

very.

Mr. Campbell was speaking when our report

LOCAL.

A SINGULAR CASE -A year ago, while the snow was yet upon the ground, a man, woman, and child, were begging food from door to door in this city. They were miserable in appearance. One morning the woman made a call at a door for relief, but before food could be brought to her she fell and expired!

It had been observed by some few persons that she as well as her husband was intelligent, though miserable and bloated. Upon her person was found no clothing but the one outside garment.

The man was questioned, and it was ascertained that he had been, in England, an Epis copal minister. They were between thirty and

forty years of age. She was buried, and he was conveyed to th Almshouse, where he died in a few days.

Their poor little daughter, five years old, had shared their misery. She was found, and placed in the Washington Orphan Asylum, where she now is, a pretty and most interest

Upon such information as was obtained from the father and the child, letters were addressed to his relations in England. But an interested relative there, it is thought, induced the belief that the man had not been married to the woman with whom he had come to this country, and no reply was returned.

But the evidence of the marriage of the wretched pair has recently been found by the sister of the deceased man, who is the wife of a Colonel in the British army, and she has just sent an eager message for the child, whom it is her purpose to adopt.

The poor father and mother had evidently been fine looking people. Their name was

The Hutchinson Family will give Concerts at Carusi's Saloon this evening, to-morrow evening, and Monday evening. It is unnecessary to praise these admirable vocalists from "the Old Granite State." Their entertainments are always delightful, and attended by every amateur of good vocal music.

John Carroll Brent has been chosen Secretary of the Washington National Monu-

THE GARDINER CASE .- Mr. Fendall announced on Wednesday that the prosecution had closed their case; when Mr. Carlisle rose and stated that sixty-one days had elapsed since the commencement of the present trial, during which the jury had patiently listened to the testimony offered, as well as heard most of the discussions on the questions of submis sion of evidence, and he and his colleague, by the permission of their client, proposed to submit the case to the jury without argument.

Mr. Fendall, on the part of the prosecution declined the offer. Mr. May opened his address to the jury

Park Benjamin is to lecture at the

Smithsonian Institute to-night, on Fashion.

BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

Very Latest by the Canada. HALIFAX, FEB. 17.—The following additional items of foreign news I add to my despatch of last evening.

Vienna.—Count Puel has drawn out a dec-

laration of neutrality, with strong leaning towards the views of the Western Powers; and has given this to Count Orloff as a final an-swer. Count Orloff's mission has therefore

The Czar's proposals were to form a defen-sive league with all the German Powers, with whom Russia would make common cause, in case the Western Powers attacked any one of them without consulting the interest of the Western Powers.

To these proposals the German Powers, through Austria, definitely refuse. Russia therefore remains isolated.

The Western Powers are im demand the evacuation of the Principalities, and compel the withdrawal of the Russian forces forthwith.

The Russian Minister in London has made a final formal visit to the Foreign Department.
It is reported, at the latest moment of the sailing of the steemer Canada, that Austria and Prussia had declared in favor of the West-

SECOND DESPATCH. Prince Napoleon has been sent to Belgium, to impress upon the King the necessity of acting firmly with Turkey and the other Powers.

He also goes to the various German States.

The French Cabinet held a council on the

30th ult., and resolved to send 80 000 troops to

Turkey.

Count Orloff's mission to Vienna was for the purpose of asking permission for the Russian force to pass through Hungary. It is reported that if the Czar failed to obtain this, Count Ocloff would visit Vienna in person.

The Russian commander at Sebastopol his

been cashiered.

The interview of Count Orloff with the Emperor of Austria was brief and unsatisfactory. The Count was greatly dissatisfied with the

And it was further reported that the Emperor of Austria would consider the passage of the Danube by the Russians equivalent to declaration of war.

The Russian Chambers had promptly grant-

ed the supplies for complete defence.

There had been no change in the condition of affairs at Kalafat; and it was rumored that there was a naval engagement on the Black Sea, in which the Russian fleet was complete-

ly destroyed.
A portion of the Turkish figet had gone Egypt, to ship 12 000 well-trained troops.

All the allied fleets had returned to Bercos

Colonel Doin, seat by the Governm France, to report on the condition of the Turkish army on the Danube, pronounces it capable of keeping the Russian army in check for a long time.

Sweden.—The hostility of the Swedes to

Russia is increasing.

Persia.—The latest accounts from Persia

state that the English influence preponderates.

Spain.—Com. Quepada has been appointed naval commander at Havans.

Revolutionary handbills had been published throughout Spain, and the feeling against the

Queen was intense.

Italy.—Great uneasiness prevails throughout Northern Italy, and an outbreak is daily expected.

Later from Texas.

NEW ORLEANS, FEB. 16.—The steamer Louisiana had arrived, bringing later dates The Condor, at Galvesten, stated that she had passed the ship James King, of Boston, in an abandoned condition.

Paper Mill Burnt. BOSTON, FEB. 17.—The Richmond paper mill, belonging to a factory at Lowell, has

Markets.

BALTIMORE, FEB 17, 12 M .- Breadstuffs have declined. Flour—sales of 1,200 barrels of Howard Street and City Mills, at \$8.00; of Howard Street and City Mills, at \$8.00; closing, held higher. Wheat—sales of 2,000 bushels white at \$1.86 a \$1.88; red \$1.84 a \$1.87. Corn—sales of 35,000 bushels, white at 80 to 85 cents, yellow at 82 to 86 cents. Butter—in kegs at 12 a 13 cents per pound; roll at 15 a 17 cents. roll at 15 a 17 cents.

BALTIMORE, FEB. 17 -On late 'Change, sales of 3,000 barrels Howard Street and City Mills flour, at \$8.12 a \$8.25.

NEW YORK, FEB. 17, 1 P. M -Flour sales of 2 000 barrels State brands, at \$8.75 a \$8 81; Southern at \$9.12. Wheat—sales of 4.000 bushels red, at \$1.98 a \$2.00. Corn sales of 18,000 bushels of mixed at \$1.00; yellow at \$1.02. Cotton firmer. Stocks firmer.

Arrival of the Canada—Four Days Later from Europe. The steamer Canada arrived at Halifax yes

terday evening, bringing Liverpool dates of February 4. The Andes, for Boston, had put back. The City of Manchester sailed on the 1st, and the Sarah Sands on the 31st. The

Baltic arrived out on the 2d.

The news is very warlike. The Russian ambassador was about leaving London.

Parliament met on the 31st, and the Queen's speech was delivered. She mentions the Turk ish difficulty in moderate terms, and congratulates the country upon the alliance with France

She also recommends an increase in the army, as war threatens from hour to hour. departure of the Russian Ministers from London and Paris was hourly expected. It is re-ported that the French and English Ministers

have been recalled from St. Petersburgh.
France will send 80,000 and England 10,000 men to Turkey; England paying half the total

The funds are quiet and not much depre Everything now depends on the position that Russia will take.

It is reported that Austria and Prussia will co-operate with France and Engla. d, but this is doubted.

Liverpool, Feb. 4 .- In cotton, prices were un changed.

Breadstuffs had been heavy since the last steamer, but closed with an improving tendency, yet on the week there is a decline of 1s. per barrel in flour, and 2d in wheat. Corn

Consols closed at 91½ to 91¾; United States stocks active, and prices tending upward—United States 6's, '65, 98½ to 99½; ditto '67, '68, 108½ to 109½; Maryland 5's, 93 to 95; Eric convertibles, 87½ to 88½.

Dreadful Steamboat Explosion. ST. LOUIS, FEB. 16 .- The Alton packet Kate Kearney exploded at the wharf this morning. killing twenty passengers and wounding many others; many were drowned. Among those badly wounded is Major Beal, of the army.

Detention of the Foreign Mails. NEW YORK, FEB 16 —The foreign mails ant from this city yesterday did not reach Bos

ton in time to go out in the steamer Arabia.

NEW YORK, FEB. 16.—There is a heavy freshet in the Hudson river. The docks at Albany are submerged.

Free Soil Convention.

BOSTON, FEB. 16.—A great Free Soil Convention is being held to-day, in Fancui! Hall, in opposition to the Nebraska Bill. All the leadopposition to the Nebraska Bill. All the leaders of the party are present. Letters were received from John P. Hale and S. P. Chase. J. W. Alvord, presiding. Speeches were made by Anson Burlingame, Joshua Leavitt, Amos Tuck, Amasa Walker, Theodore Parker, Henry Wilson, and others. Mr. Tuck said, if the bill passes, the People must prepare for a bitter contest, with the cry for the repeal of all the Compromises. A letter from Preston King, of New York, was read. New York, was read.

At her residence, in Georgetown, on the evening of the 15th instant, Mrs. EMILY Cor-CORAN, reliet of the late Col. Thos. Corcoran, aged 44 years.
On Thursday, the 16th instant, CHARLES GILBERT, youngest son of Johanna and Isaac

THE HUTCHINSON FAMILY. FROM the Old Granite State, are happy to an-nounce to the citizens of Washington that they will give three of their VOCAL ENTERTAINMENTS

AT CARUST'S SALOON. commencing on this (Friday) evening, February 17, 1854, and positively closing Monday, the 20th, introducing their new compositions.

Tickets 50 cents; children half price—to be had at the principal Music and Bookstores.

FREEDOM AND PUBLIC FAITH.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

ON THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILLS. In United States Senate, February 17, 1854.

The United States, at the close of the Revolution, rested southward on the St. Mary's, and westward on the Mississippi, and possessed a broad, unoccupied domain, circumscribed by those rivers, the Alleghany mountains, and the great Northern takes. The Constitution anticipated the division of this domain into States, to be admitted as members of the Union, but if resider received for but it neither provided for nor anticipated any enlargement of the national boundaries. The People, engaged in reorganizing their Governments, improving their social systems, and establishing relations of commerce and friendship with other nations, remained many years content within their apparently ample limits.
But it was already foreseen that the free navigation of the Mississippi would soon become an
urgent public want.
France, although she had lost Canada, in

chivalrous battle, on the Heights of Abraham, in 1763, nevertheless, still retained her ancient territories on the western bank of the Mississippi. She had also, just before the breaking out of her own fearful revolution, re-acquired, by a secret treaty, the possessions on the Gulf of Mexico, which, in a recent war, had been wrested from her by Spain. Her First Consul, among those brilliant achievements which proved him the first Statesman as well as the first Captain of Europe, sagaciously sold the whole of these possessions to the United States, for a liberal sum, and thus replenished his treasury, while he saved from his enemies, and transferred to a friendly Power, distant and vast regions, which, for want of adequate naval orce, he was unable to defend.

This purchase of Louisiana from France, by the United States, involved a great dispute concerning the western limits of that province; and this controversy, having remained open until 1819, was then adjusted by a treaty, in which they relinquished Texas to Spain, and accepted a cession of the early-discovered and long-inhabited provinces of East Florida and West Florida. The United States stipulated, in each of these cases, to admit the countries thus annexed into the Federal Union.

The acquisitions of Oregon, by discovery and occupation, of Texas, by her voluntary annexation, and of New Mexico and California, including what is now called Utah, by war, completed that rapid course of enlargement, at the close of which our frontier has been fixed near the centre of what was New Spain, on the At-lantic side of the continent, while on the west, as on the east, only an ocean separates us from the nations of the old world. It is not in my way now to speculate on the question, how long we are to rest on these advanced posi-

Slavery, before the Revolution, existed in all the thirteen Colonies, as it did also in nearly all the other European plantations in America. But it had been forced by British authority, for political and commercial ends, on the American People, against their own sagacious instincts of policy, and their stronger feelings of justice and

umanity.

They had protested and remonstrated against the system, earnestly, for forty years, and they ceased to protest and remonstrate against it only when they finally committed their entire cause of complaint to the arbitrament of arms. An earnest spirit of emancipation was abroad in the Colonies at the close of the Revolution, and all of them, except, perhaps, South Carolina and Georgia, anticipated, desired, and designed an early removal of the system from the country. The suppression of the African slave trade, which was universally regarded as anillary to that great measure, was not, without

much reluctance, postponed until 1808.

While there was no national power, and no claim or disire for national power, anywhere, to compel involuntary emancipation in the States where slavery existed, there was at the s war threatens from hour to hour.

A reply had been given in writing to the zar's inquiry respecting the fleets, and the leparture of the Russian Ministers from Lonposed, as early as 1784, to exclude it from the ational domain which should be constituted by cessions from the States to the United States. He recommended and urged the measure as ancillary, also, to the ultimate policy of eman-cipation. There seems to have been at first no deep jealousy between the emancipating and the non-emancipating States; and the pol-icy of admitting new States was not disturbed by questions concerning slavery. Vermont, a non-slaveholding State, was admitted in 1793. Kentucky, a tramontane slaveholding com-munity, having been detached from Virginia, was admitted, without being questioned, about the same time. So, also, Tennessee, which the same time. So, also, Tennessee, which was a similar community separated from North Carolina, was admitted in 1796, with a stipulation that the Ordinance which Mr. Jefferson had first proposed, and which had in the mean time been adopted for the Territory northwest of the Ohio, should not be held to apply within her limits. The same course was adopted in organizing Territorial Governments for Mississippi and Alabama, slaveholding communities which had been detached from South Carolina and Georgia. All these States and Territories were situated southwest of the Ohio river, all were more or less already peopled by slave-holders with their slaves; and to have excluded slavery within their limits would have been a national act, not of preventing the introduction of slavery, but of abolishing slavery. In short, the region southwest of the Ohio river present-ed a field in which the policy of preventing the introduction of slavery was impracticable. Our forefathers never attempted what was im-

But the case was otherwise in that fair an

broad region which stretched away from the banks of the Ohio, northward to the lakes, and westward to the Mississippi. It was yet free, or practically free, from the presence of slaves, and was nearly uninhabited, and quite unoccupied. There was then no Baltimore and Ohio railroad, no Erie railroad, no New York Central railroad, no Boston and Ogdensburgh railroad; there was no railroad through Canada; nor, indeed, any road around or across the mountains; no imperial Erie canal, no Welland canal, no lockages around the rapids and the falls of the St. Lawrence, the Mohawk, and the Niagara rivers, and no steam navigation on the lakes or on the Hudson, or on the Missis sippi. There, in that remote and secluded region, the prevention of the introduction of Slavery was possible; and there our forefathers. who left no possible national good unattempted, did prevent it. It makes one's heart bound with joy and gratitude, and lift itself up with mingled pride and veneration, to read the history of that great transaction. Discarding the trite and common forms of expressing the national will, they did not merely "vote," or "resolve," or "enact," as on other occasions, but they "ORDAINED," in language marked at once with precision, amplification, solemnity, and emphasis, that there "shall be neither sla-very nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." And they further ordained and declared that this law should be considered a COMPACT between the original States and the People and States of said Territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent. The Ordinance was agreed to unanimously. Virginia, in re-affirming her cession of the territory, ratified it, and the first Congress held

under the Constitution solemnly renewed and

In pursuance of this Ordinance, the several In pursuance of this Ordinance, the several Territorial Governments successively established in the Northwest Territory were organized with a prohibition of the introduction of slavery, and in due time, though at successive periods, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, States erected within that Territory, have come into the Union with Constitutions in their hands forever prohibiting slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime. They are yet young; but, nevertheless, who has ever seen elsewhere such States as they are! There are gathered the young, the vigorous, the active, the enlightened sons of every State, the flower and chivalry of every State in this broad Union; and there the emigrant for conscience sake, and for freedom's sake, from every land in Europe, from proud and all-conquering Britain, from heartdom's sake, from every land in Europe, from proud and all-conquering Britain, from heart-broken Ireland, from sunny Italy, from mercurial France, from spiritual Germany, from chivalrous Hungary, and from honest and brave old Sweden and Norway. Thence are already coming ample supplies of corn and wheat and wine for the manufacturers of the East, for the planters of the tropics, and even for the artisans and the armies of Europe; and thence will continue to come in long success. the artisans and the armies of Europe; and thence will continue to come in long succession, as they have already begun to come, statesmen and legislators for this continent.

Thus it appears, Mr. President, that it was the policy of our fathers, in regard to the original domain of the United States, to prevent the

introduction of slavery, wherever it was practicable. This policy encountered greater difficulites when it came under consideration with a view to its establishment in regions not in-cluded within our original domain. While slavery had been actually abolished already, by some of the emancipating States, several of them, owing to a great change in the relative value of the productions of slave labor, had fallen off into the class of non-emancipating States; and now the whole family of States was divided and classified as slaveholding or slave States, and non-slaveholding or free States. A rivalry for political ascendency was soon developed; and, besides the motives of interest and philanthropy which had before existed, there was now on each side a desire to increase, from among the candidates for admission into the Union, the number of States in

their respective classes, and so their relative weight and influence in the Federal Councils. The country which had been acquired from France was, in 1804, organized in two Territories, one of which, including New Orleans as its capital, was called Orleans, and the other, having St. Louis for its chief town, was called Louisiana. In 1812, the Territory of Orleans was admitted as a new State, under the name of Louisiana. It had been an old slaveholding of Louisiana. It had been an old slaveholding colony of France, and the prevention of slavery within it would have been a simple act of abolition. At the same time, the Territory of Louisiana, by authority of Congress, took the name of Missouri; and, in 1819, the portion thereof which now constitutes the State of Arkansas was detached, and beame a Territory, under that name. In 1819, Missouri, which was then but thinly peopled, and had an inconsidereble number of slaves, applied for admission into the Union, and her application brought the question of extending to that State, and to other new States in the region acquired from France, the policy of the Ordinance of 1787, to a direct issue. The House of Representatives insisted on a prohibition against the further introduction of slavery in the State, as a condition of her admission. The Senate disagreed with the House in that demand. The non-slaveholding States sustained the House, and the slaveholding States sustained the Senate. The difference was radical, and tended

Senate. The difference was radical, and fended towards revolution.

One party maintained that the condition demanded was constitutional, the other that it was unconstitutional. The public mind became intensely excited, and painful apprehensions of disunion and civil war-began to pre-

vail in the country.

In this crisis, a majority of both House agreed upon a plan for the adjustment of the controversy. By this plan, Maine, a non-slaveholding State, was to be admitted; Missouthe condition before mentioned; and in all that part of the Territory acquired from France, which was north of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. of north latitude, slavery was to be forever prohibited. Louisiana, which was a part of that Territory, had been admitted as a slave State eight years before; and now, not only was Missouri to be admitted as a slave State, but Arkansas, which was south of that line, by strong implication, was also to be admitted as a slaveholding State. I need not indicate what were the equivalents which the respective parties were to receive in this arrangement, further than to say that the slaveholding States practically were to receive slaveholding States, the free States to receive a desert, a solitude, in which they might, if they could, plant the germs of future free States. This measure was dopted. It was a great national transactionthe first of a class of transactions which have since come to be thoroughly defined and well understood, under the name of compromises. My own opinions concerning them are well known, and are not in question here. According

known, and are not in question here. According to the general understanding, they are marked by peculiar circumstances and features, viz:

First, there is a division of opinion upon some vital national question between the two Houses of Congress, which division is irreconcilable, except by mutual concessions of interests and opinions, which the Houses deem constitutional and just.

Secondly, they are rendered necessary by

Secondly, they are rendered necessary by impending calamities, to result from the failure of legislation, and to be no otherwise averted than by such mutual concessions, or sacrifices. Thirdly, that such concessions are mutual and equal, or are accepted as such, and so be-come conditions of the mutual arrangement.

Fourthly, that by this mutual exchange of conditions, the transaction takes on the nature and condition of a contract, compact, or treaty, between the parties represented; and so, ac-cording to well-settled principles of morality and public law, the statute which embodies it derstood, by those who uphold this system of legislation, to be irrevocable and irrepeala-ble, except by the mutual consent of both, or of all the parties concerned. Not, indeed, that it is absolutely irrepealable, but that it cannot be repealed without a violation of honor, justice, and good faith, which it is presumed will

Such was the Compromise of 1820. Missouri came into the Union immediately as a slaveholding State, and Arkansas came in as a slaveholding State, without objection, eight years afterward. Nebraska, the part of the Territory reserved exclusively for free Territories and free States, has remained a wilderness ever since. And now it is proposed here to abrogate, not, indeed, the whole Compromise, but only that part of it which saved Nebraska as free territory, to be afterwards divided into non-slaveholding States, which should be ad-mitted into the Union. And this is proposed, notwithstanding an universal acquiescence in the Compromise, by both parties, for thirty years, and its confirmation, over and over again, by many acts of successive Congresses, and notwithstanding that the slaveholding States have peaceably enjoyed, ever since it was made, all their equivalents, while, owing to circumstances which will hereafter appear, the non-slaveholding States have not practically enjoyed any of those guarantied to them.

This is the question now before the Senator of the United States of America.

It is a question of transcendent importance.

The proviso of 1820, to be abrogated in Nebraska, is the Ordinance of the Continental Congress of 1787, extended over a new part of the national domain, acquired under our pres-ent Constitution. It is rendered venerable by its antiquity, and sacred by the memory of that Congress, which, in surrendering its trust, after establishing the Ordinance, enjoined it upon posterity, always to remember that the cause the United States was the cause of Human Nature. The question involves an issue of public faith, and national morality and honor. It will be a sad day for this Republic, when such a question shall be deemed unworthy of grave discussion and intense interest. Even it were certain that the inhibition of slavery in the region concerned was unnecessary, and if the question was thus reduced to a mere ab straction, yet even that abstraction would in volve the testimony of the United States on the expediency, wisdom, morality, and justice, of the system of human bondage, with which this and other portions of the world have been so long afflicted; and it will be a melancholy day for the Republic and for mankind, when her decision on even such an abstraction shall command no respect, and inspire no hope into the hearts of the oppressed. But it is no such abstraction. It was no unnecessary dispute, no mere contest of blind passion, that brought no mere contest of blind passion, that brought that Compromise into being. Slavery and Freedom were active antagonists, then seeking for ascendency in this Union. Both Slavery and Freedom are more vigorous, active, and self-aggrandizing now, than they were then, or ever were before or since that period. The contest between them has been only protracted, not decided. It is a great feature in our nanot decided. It is a great feature in our na-tional Herenfter. So the question of adhering to or abrogating this Compromise is no un-meaning issue, and no contest of mere blind

passion now.

To adhere, is to secure the occupation by freemen, with free labor, of a region in the very centre of the continent, capable of susnining, and in that event destined, though it may be only after a far-distant period, to sustain ten, twenty, thirty, forty millions of people and their successive generations forever!

To abrogate, is to resign all that vast region

to chances which mortal vision cannot fully foresee; perhaps to the sovereignty of such stinted and short-lived communities as those o which Mexico and South America and the West India Islands present us with examples; perhaps to convert that region into the scene of long and desolating conflicts between not merely races, but castes, to end, like a similar conflict in Egypt, in a convulsive exodus of the oppressed people, despoiling their superi-ors; perhaps, like one not dissimilar in Spain, in the forcible expulsion of the inferior race, exhausting the State by the sudden and complete suppression of a great resource of national wealth and labor; perhaps in the disastrous expulsion, even of the superior race itself, by a people too suddenly raised from slavery to lib-erty, as in St. Domingo. To adhere, is to secure forever the presence here, after some lapse of time, of two, four, ten, twenty, or more Senators, and of Representatives in larger pro-portions, to uphold the policy and interests of the non-slaveholding States, and balance that ever-increasing representation of slaveholding States, which past experience, and the decay of the Spanish American States, admonish us has only just begun; to save what the non-slaveholding States have in mints, navy yards, the military academy and fortifications, to bal-ance against the capital and federal institutions in the slaveholding States; to save against any in the slaveholding States; to save against any danger from adverse or hostile policy, the culture, the manufactures, and the commerce, as well as the just influence and weight of the national principles and sentiments of the slaveholding States. To adhere, is to save, to the non-slaveholding States, as well as to the slaveholding States, always, and in every event, a right of way and free communication across the continent, to and with the States on the Pacific coasts, and with the right States on the Pacific coasts, and with the rising States on the islands in the South Sea, and with all the east-

ern nations on the vast continent of Asia.

To abrogate, on the contrary, is to commit all these precious interests to the chances and hazards of embarrassment and injury by legis-lation, under the influence of social, political, the event of the secession of the slaveholding States, which is so often threatened in their name, but I thank God without their authority, to give to a servile population a La Vendee at the very sources of the Mississippi, and in the very recesses of the Rocky Mountains.

Nor is this last a contingency against which a statesman, when engaged in giving a Consti-tution for such a Territory, so situated, must veil his eyes. It is a statesman's province and duty to look before as well as after. I know, indeed, the present loyalty of the American People, North and South, and East and West. I know that it is a sentiment stronger than any sectional interest or ambition, and stronger than even the love of equality in the non-slaveholding States; and stronger, I doubt not, than the love of slavery in the slaveholding States. But I do not know, and no mortal sagacity does know, the seductions of interest and ambition and the influences of passion, which are yet to be matured in every region. I know this, however; that this Union is safe now, and that it will be safe so long as impartial political equality shall constitute the basis of society, as it has heretofore done, in even half of these States, and they shall thus maintain a just equilibrium against the slaveholding States. am well assured, also, on the other hand, that if ever the slaveholding States shall multiply themselves, and extend their sphere, so that they could, without association with the nonslaveholding States, constitute of themselves a commercial republic, from that day their rule, through the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative powers of this Government, will be such as will be hard for the non-slaveholding States to bear; and their pride and ambition, since they are congregations of men, and are moved by human passions, will consent to no Union in which they shall not so rule.

The slaveholding States already possess the mouths of the Mississippi, and their territory reaches far northward along its banks, on one side to the Ohio, and on the other even to the confluence of the Missouri. They stretch their dominion now from the banks of the Delaware, quite around bay, headland, and promontory, to the Rio Grande. They will not stop, although they now think they may, on the sum-mit of the Sierra Nevada; nay, their armed pioneers are already in Sonora, and their eyes are already fixed, never to be taken off, on the island of Cuba, the Queen of the Antilles. If we of the non-slaveholding States surrender to them now the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and the very sources of the Mississippi, what territory will be secure, what terri can be secured hereafter, for the creation and organization of free States, within our ocean-bound domain? What territories on this continent will remain unappropriated and un-occupied, for us to annex? What territories, even if we are able to buy or conquer them from Great Britain or Russia, will the slaveholding States suffer, much less aid, us to annex, to restore the equilibrium which by this unnecessary measure we shall have so unwisely, so hurriedly, so suicidally subverted?

Nor am I to be told that only a few slaves

will enter into this vast region. One slave-holder in a new Territory, with access to the

Executive ear at Washington, exercises more

political influence than five hundred freemen.

It is not necessary that all or a majority of the citizens of a State shall be slaveholders, to con-

stitute a slaveholding State. Delaware has only

tion is not substantially different in Maryland tion is not substantially different in Maryland and in Missouri; and yet they are slaveholding States. These, sir, are the stakes in this legislative game, in which I lament to see, that while the representatives of the slaveholding States are unanimously and earnestly playing to win, so many of the representatives of the non-slaveholding States are with even greater and diligence playing to the state of the non-slaveholding states are with even greater and diligence playing to be stated to the state of the non-slaveholding states are with even greater and stated to the state of the

zeal and diligence playing to lose.

Mr. President, the Committee who have recommended these twin bills for the organization of the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas hold the affirmative in the argument upon their passage.

What is the case they present to the Senate

and the country?

They have submitted a report; but that report, brought in before they had introduced or even conceived this bold and daring measure of even conceived this bold and daring measure of abrogating the Missouri Compromise, directs all

its arguments against it.

The Committee say, in their report:

abrogating the Missouri Compromise, directs all its arguments against it.

The Committee say, in their report:

"Such being the character of the controversy, in respect to the territory acquired from Mexico. a similar question has arisen in regard to the right to hold slaves in the proposed Territory of Nobraska, when the Indian laws shall be withdrawn, and the country thrown open to emigration and settlement. By the Sts section of 'an act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories, approved March 6, 1820, it was provided: 'That in all that Territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisians, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited: Provided, sluways. That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any State or Territory of the United States, such fugilitie may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service, as aforesaid."

"Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by valid enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various Territories of the Union. In the opin on of those eminent statesmen who hold that Congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, the Sth section of the act proparatory to the daissussion of these constitutions of the Union sustains the

This report gives us the deliberate judgmen of the Committee on two important points. First, that the Compromise of 1850 did not, hy its letter or by its spirit, repeal, or render neces sary, or even propose, the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise; and, secondly, that the Missouri Compromise ought not now to be abrogated. And now, sir, what do we next hear from this Committee? First, two similar and kindred bills, actually abrogating the Missouri Compromise, which, in their report, they had told us ought not to be abrogated at all. had told us ought not to be abrogated at all. Secondly, these bills declare on their face, in substance, that that Compromise was already abrogated by the spirit of that very Compromise of 1850, which, in their report they had just shown us, left the Compromise of 1820 absolutely unaffected and unimpaired. Thirdly, the Committee favor us, by their chairman, with an oral explanation, that the amended bills abrogating the Missouri Compromise are identical with their previous bill, which did not abrogate it, and are only made to differ in abrogate it, and are only made to differ in phraseology, to the end that the provisions con-tained in their previous, and now discarded, bill, shall be absolutely clear and certain.

itself, but I must take leave to say that the in-consistencies and self-contradictions contained in the papers it has given us, have destroyed ns, on the part of those documents, to

respect, here or elsewhere.

The recital of the effect of the Compromi of 1850 upon the Compromise of 1820, as finally revised, corrected, and amended, here in the face of the Senate, means after all substantially what that recital meant as it stood before it was perfected, or else it means nothing tangible or worthy of consideration at all. What if the spirit, or even the letter, of the Compromise laws of 1850 did conflict with the Compromise of 1820? The Compromise of 1820 was, by its very nature, a Compromise irrepealable and unchangeable, without a violation of honor, justice, and good faith. The Compromise of 1850, if it impaired the previous Compro-mise to the extent of the loss to free labor of one acre of the Territory of Nebraska, was either absolutely void, or ought, in all subse-

qent legislation, to be deemed and held void. What if the spirit or the letter of the Com promise was a violation of the Compromise of 1820? Then, inasmuch as the Compromise of 1820 was inviolable, the attempted violation of it shows that the so-called Compromise of 1850 was to that extent not a Compromise at all, but a factitious, spurious, and pretented Compromise. What if the letter or the spirit of the Compromise of 1850 did supersede or impair or even conflict with the Compromise of 1820? Then that is a reason, not for abrogating the irrepealable and inviolable Compromise of 1820, but the spurious and pretended Compromise of 1850.

Mr. President, why is this reason for the proposed abrogation of the Compromise of 1820 signed in these bills at all ? It is unnecessary. The assignment of a reason adds nothing to the force or weight of the abrogation itself. Either the fact alleged as a reason is true or it is not true. If it be untrue, your asserting it here will not make it true. If it be true, it is apparent in the text of the law of 1850, without the aid of legislative exposition now. It is unusual. It is unparliamentary. The language of the lawgiver, whether the sovereign be Democratic, Republican, or Despotic, is al-ways the same. It is mandatory, imperative. If the lawgiver explains at all in a statute the reason for it, the reason is that it is his pleasure—sic volo, sic jubeo. Look at the Compromise of 1820. Does it plead an excuse for its commands? Look at the Compromise of 1850. drawn by the master hand of our American Chatham. Does that bespeak your favor by a quibbling or shuffling apology? Look at your own, now rejected, first Nebraska bill, which, by conclusive implication, saved the effect of the Missouri Compromise. Look at any other bill ever reported by the Committee on Territo-ries. Look at any other bill now on your calendar. Examine all the laws on your statute books. Do you find any one bill or statute which ever came bowing, stooping, and wrig-gling into the Senate, pleading an excuse for its clear and explicit declaration of the sovereign and irresistible will of the American Peo-ple? The departure from this habit in this solitary case betrays self-distrust, and an attempt on the part of the bill to divert the public attention, to raise complex and immate rial issues, to perplex and bewilder and com found the People by whom this transaction is to be reviewed. Look again at the vacillation 2,000 slaves, against 91,000 freemen; and yet betrayed in the frequent changes of the struc-Delaware is a slaveholding State. The propor- ture of this apology. At first the recital told us

that the eighth section of the Compromise act of 1820 was superseded by the principles of the Compromise laws of 1850—as if any one had ever heard of a supersedeas of one local law by the mere principles of another local law, enacted for an altogether different region, thirty years afterwards. On another day we were told, by an amendment of the recital, that the Compromise of 1820 was not superseded by the Compromise of 1850 at all, but was only "inconsistent with" it—as if a local act which was irrepealable was now to be abrogated, because it was inconsistent with a subsequent enactment, which had no application whatever within the region to which the first enactment was confined. On a third day the meaning of the recital was further and finally that the eighth section of the Compromise act meaning of the recital was further and finally elucidated by an amendment, which declared that the first irrepealable act protecting Nebraska from slavery was now declared "inoperative and void," because it was inconsist-

ent with the present purposes of Congress not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom.

But take this apology in whatever form it may be expressed, and test its logic by a simple

process.

The law of 1820 secured free institution the regions acquired from France in 1803, by the wise and prudent foresight of the Congress of the United States. The law of 1850, on the of the United States. The law of 1850, on the contrary, committed the choice between free and slave institutions in New Mexico and Utah—Territories acquired from Mexico nearly fifty years afterward—to the interested cupidity or the caprice of their earliest and accidental occupants. Free Institutions and Slave Institutions are equal, but the interested cupidity of the pioneer is a wiser arbiter, and his judgment a surer safeguard, than the collective wisdom of the American People and the most solemn and time-honored statute of the American Congress. Therefore, let the law of freedom in the territory acquired from France be now annulled and abrogated, and let the fortunes and fate of Freedom and Slavery, in the region acquired from France, be, henceforward, determined by the votes of some seven hundred camp followers around Fort Leavenworth, and the still smaller number of trappers, Govern-ment schoolmasters, and mechanics, who attend the Indians in their seasons of rest from hunting in the passes of the Rocky Mountains. Sir, this syllogism may satisfy you and other Senators; but as for me, I must be content to adhere to the earlier system. Stare super

antiquas vias.

There is yet another difficulty in this new heory. Let it be granted that, in order to carry out a new principle recently adopted in New Mexico, you can supplant a compromise in Nebraska, yet there is a maxim of public law which forbids you from supplanting that compromise, and establishing a new system there, until you first restore the parties in interest there to their statu quo before the compromis to be supplanted was established. First, then, remand Missouri and Arkansas back to the unsettled condition, in regard to slavery, which they held before the Compromise of 1820 was enacted, and then we will hear you talk of escinding that Compromise. You cannot do this. You ought not to do it, if you could; and because you cannot and ought not to do it, you cannot, without violating law, justice. equity, and honor, abrogate the guarantee of

freedom in Nebraska.

There is still another and not less serious difficulty. You call the Slavery laws of 1850 a compromise between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. For the purposes of this argument, let it be granted that they were such a compromise. It was nevertheless a compromise concerning slavery in the Territo-ries acquired from Mexico, and by the letter of the compromise it extended no further. Can you now, by an act which is not a compromise between the same parties, but a mere ordinary law, extend the force and obligation of the principles of that Compromise of 1850 into regions not only excluded from it, but absolutely protected from your intervention there by a solemn Compromise of thirty years' duration, and invested with a sanctity scarcely inferior to that which hallows the Constitution itself?

Can the Compromise of 1850, by a mere ordinary act of legislation, be extended beyond the plain, known, fixed intent and understand ing of the parties at the time that contract was made, and yet be binding on the parties to it, not merely legally, but in honor and con-science? Can you abrogate a compromise by passing any law of less dignity than a compromise? If so, of what value is any one or the whole of the Compromises? Thus you see that these bills violate both of the Compromises-not more that of 1820 than that of

Will you maintain in argument that it was understood by the parties interested throughout the country, or by either of them, or by any representative of either, in either House of Congress, that the principle then established should extend beyond the limits of the territories acquired from Mexico, into the territories acquired nearly fifty years before, from France, and then reposing under the guarantee of the Compromise of 1820? I know not how Senators may vote, but I do know what they will say. I appeal to the honorable Senator from Michigan, [Mr. Cass.] than whom none performed a more distinguished part in establishing the Compromise of 1850, whether he so intended or understood. I appeal to the honorable and distinguished. able and distinguished Senator, the senior representative from Tennessee, [Mr. Bell.,] who performed a distinguished part also. Did he so understand the Compromise of 1850? I appeal to that very distinguished—nay, sir, that expression falls short of his eminence—that il-lustrious man, the Senator from Missouri, who led the opposition here to the Compromise of 1850. Did he understand that that Compromise in any way overreached or impaired the Compromise of 1820? Sir, that distinguished person, while opposing the combination of the several laws on the subject of California and the Territories, and Slavery, together, in one bill, so as to constitute a Compromise, never-theless voted for each one of those bills, severally; and in that way, and that way only, they were passed. Had he known or understood that any one of them overreached and impaired the Missouri Compromise, we all know he would have perished before he would have

given it his support. Sir, if it was not irreverent, I would dare to call up the author of both of the Compromise in question, from his honored, though yet scarcely grass-covered grave, and challenge any advocate of this measure to confront that imperious shade, and say that, in making the ompromise of 1850, he intended or dreamed that he was subverting, or preparing the way for a subversion of, his greater work of 1820. Sir, if that eagle spirit is yet lingering here over the scene of his mortal labors, and watching over the welfare of the Republic he loved so well, his heart is now moved with more than human indignation against those who are perverting his last great public act from its legitimate uses, not merely to subvert the column, but to wrench from its very bed the base of the

column that perpetuates his fame. [TO BE CONCLUDED TO-MORROW.]

BOOK AGENTS WANTED,

To circulate in every county in the Union some most rapid selling, popular, and beautifully illustrated subscription books. A small cash capital required. Apply to HENRY HOWE, 111 Main street, Cincinnati, Ohio. Fob. 16.

REAL GO-AHEAD YOUNG MEN ANTING a fine Travelling Agency this spring address, post paid, enclosing 2 postage stamps M. J. COOK,